

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed March 16, 2004, has been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

In response to the Examiner's objection to the specification as failing to provide antecedent basis for the function of the gap defined between the diffusion and reflection plate and the rear side surface of the light guide as recited in claim 7, Applicants hereby have canceled that limitation from claim 7, thereby rendering that objection moot.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qiao in view of Tai, Suzuki, and U.S. 5,057,974 to Mizobe. These references have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicants' invention as now claimed in any manner. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim 7 has been amended and it now requires a diffusion and reflection plate having a coating formed by screen dot printing of a pigment including titanium white so as to diffuse and reflect the light from the rear side surface. Support for this amendment is found, for example, on page 5, lines 8 through 19 of the specification. Since the titanium white has a high reflectivity and is formed into dots, the diffusion and reflection plate reflects a large quantity of light which is perfectly diffused. Thus, in accordance with the present invention, uniform and high light is discharged from the light guide, thereby illuminating the display brightly. It appears that none of the cited references, taken individually or in combination, teaches or

suggests the coating being formed by screen dot printing of a pigment or ink including titanium white so as to diffuse and reflect the light from the rear side surface. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 7 is allowable over the prior art combination.

Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form and it now requires the coating be formed by screen dot printing of ink including titanium white so as to diffuse and reflect the light from the rear side surface. Therefore, claim 8 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 7.

Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed March 16, 2004, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 7 and 8 is now in condition for allowance. Wherefore, Applicants respectfully request a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ,
DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD

By: 

Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16